

U.S. Department of Education
2014 National Blue Ribbon Schools Program

[X] Public or [] Non-public

For Public Schools only: (Check all that apply) [X] Title I [] Charter [] Magnet [] Choice

Name of Principal Kodi Goracke

(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., etc.) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name ACGC Elementary School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 302 South 2nd Street

(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address.)

City Atwater State MN Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 56209-1045

County Meeker County State School Code Number* 2396

Telephone 320-974-8841 Fax 320-857-2989

Web site/URL http://www.acgc.k12.mn.us E-mail GorackeK@acgcfalcons.org

Twitter Handle _____ Facebook Page _____ Google+ _____

Blog

YouTube/URL _____ http://falcons.areavoices.com Other Social Media Link _____

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

Date

(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent* Mrs. Sherri Broderius E-mail: broderiuss@acgcfalcons.org

(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name A.C.G.C. Tel. 320-857-2276

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

Date

(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board

President/Chairperson Mr. Joel Gratz

(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

Date

(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature)

**Non-public Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*

PART I – ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

Include this page in the school’s application as page 2.

The signatures on the first page of this application (cover page) certify that each of the statements below concerning the school’s eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school configuration includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even a K-12 school, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made its Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) or Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as “persistently dangerous” within the last two years.
3. To meet final eligibility, a public school must meet the state’s AMOs or AYP requirements in the 2013-2014 school year and be certified by the state representative. Any status appeals must be resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.
4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2008 and each tested grade must have been part of the school for the past three years.
6. The nominated school has not received the National Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, or 2013.
7. The nominated school has no history of testing irregularities, nor have charges of irregularities been brought against the school at the time of nomination. The U.S. Department of Education reserves the right to disqualify a school’s application and/or rescind a school’s award if irregularities are later discovered and proven by the state.
8. The nominated school or district is not refusing Office of Civil Rights (OCR) access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
9. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
10. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution’s equal protection clause.
11. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

DISTRICT (Question 1 is not applicable to non-public schools)

1. Number of schools in the district (per district designation):
- 1 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
 - 0 Middle/Junior high schools
 - 0 High schools
 - 0 K-12 schools
- 1 TOTAL

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

2. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:
- ☐ Urban or large central city
 - ☐ Suburban with characteristics typical of an urban area
 - ☐ Suburban
 - ☒ Small city or town in a rural area
 - ☐ Rural
3. 3 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
4. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

| Grade | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |
|----------------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| PreK | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K | 28 | 29 | 57 |
| 1 | 37 | 25 | 62 |
| 2 | 25 | 24 | 49 |
| 3 | 34 | 25 | 59 |
| 4 | 36 | 24 | 60 |
| 5 | 30 | 20 | 50 |
| 6 | 32 | 31 | 63 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Students | 222 | 178 | 400 |

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- 1 % American Indian or Alaska Native
 - 0 % Asian
 - 1 % Black or African American
 - 6 % Hispanic or Latino
 - 0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 - 92 % White
 - 0 % Two or more races
 - 100 % Total**

(Only these seven standard categories should be used to report the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The Final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic Data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.)

6. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2012 - 2013 year: 8%

This rate should be calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.

| Steps For Determining Mobility Rate | Answer |
|--|--------|
| (1) Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the school year | 30 |
| (2) Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the 2012-2013 school year | 35 |
| (3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)] | 65 |
| (4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1 | 785 |
| (5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4) | 0.083 |
| (6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100 | 8 |

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 1 %
3 Total number ELL
 Number of non-English languages represented: 1
 Specify non-English languages: Spanish
8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 52 %
 Total number students who qualify: 209

If this method is not an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the free and reduced-priced school meals program, supply an accurate estimate and explain how the school calculated this estimate.

9. Students receiving special education services: 21 %
85 Total number of students served

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| 7 Autism | 0 Orthopedic Impairment |
| 10 Deafness | 6 Other Health Impaired |
| 0 Deaf-Blindness | 20 Specific Learning Disability |
| 1 Emotional Disturbance | 28 Speech or Language Impairment |
| 0 Hearing Impairment | 0 Traumatic Brain Injury |
| 4 Mental Retardation | 0 Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| 0 Multiple Disabilities | 9 Developmentally Delayed |

10. Use Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs), rounded to nearest whole numeral, to indicate the number of personnel in each of the categories below:

| | Number of Staff |
|--|-----------------|
| Administrators | 1 |
| Classroom teachers | 21 |
| Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc. | 10 |
| Paraprofessionals | 12 |
| Student support personnel e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment coaches, etc. | 4 |

11. Average student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 19:1

12. Show daily student attendance rates. Only high schools need to supply yearly graduation rates.

| Required Information | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Daily student attendance | 96% | 96% | 95% | 96% | 96% |
| High school graduation rate | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

13. **For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools)**

Show percentages to indicate the post-secondary status of students who graduated in Spring 2013

| Post-Secondary Status | |
|---|----|
| Graduating class size | 0 |
| Enrolled in a 4-year college or university | 0% |
| Enrolled in a community college | 0% |
| Enrolled in career/technical training program | 0% |
| Found employment | 0% |
| Joined the military or other public service | 0% |
| Other | 0% |

14. Indicate whether your school has previously received a National Blue Ribbon Schools award.

Yes_ No X

If yes, select the year in which your school received the award.

PART III – SUMMARY

At Atwater-Cosmos-Grove City (ACGC) Public School we believe that everything we do is about student achievement.

The mission of ACGC Elementary is to provide a positive, safe learning environment that promotes high levels of student achievement through standard based curriculum and data analysis by challenging students to their fullest potential with hands on learning and positive collaboration while inspiring lifelong learning.

Our vision at ACGC Elementary is to build on our student achievement by continuing to grow an additional 4% in Math and 5% in Reading on state testing through best practices, professional collaboration and student centered outcomes.

ACGC is an often-imitated, innovative organization recognized by its peers, by industry, and by professional organizations. It wasn't always like that. Aggressively optimistic from the outset, the newly minted ACGC district was built to accommodate the rural population of what had been three separate districts. The challenges of a significant special education population, free and reduced lunch qualification of approximately fifty percent, declining enrollments throughout the region, and the draw of open enrollment into surrounding districts took their toll. ACGC spent some time in statutory operating debt and ultimately became a priority school. ACGC needed to change, so it did.

In 2009, voters approved an increase to the existing operating levy. In 2010, ACGC converted its calendar to a four-day week. In 2011, ACGC developed intimate relationships for student success with the Regional Centers of Excellence, Resource Training and Solutions, Minnesota Department of Education, United Way, Regional Principals' Collaborative, ACGC Ministerial Association, district-wide City Councils, and the Southwest/West Central Service Cooperative and the evolution of ACGC truly began.

Notable among the changes are:

We formed Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and set aside time weekly for teachers to plan methods for reducing achievement gaps, strategies for student success and continued high performing grades, all while focusing on data driven decision making.

We created and adopted a hybrid teacher and principal professional growth plan with a focus on formative assessment, using clear learning goals and scales, and tracking student progress all within a plan that supports student achievement through quality professional development. We focused two years on intensive training for all administration and teaching staff in the Marzano Framework for Evaluation.

To create a safe environment we added controlled entry, cameras and an elevated personal presence in the common areas. Equally important in that endeavor are the weekly lessons the school social workers provide students from our bully prevention curriculum and our on-site school-linked mental health practitioners.

Every student is an individual and we support growth through Targeted Services when we identify those benefiting from additional reinforcement outside school hours. We take advantage of the availability of Reading Corps for our preschool to third grade students.

We consciously and intentionally maintain small class sizes that allow for differentiated teaching. We take further advantage of small class size by departmentalizing our upper elementary grades. Our special education department focuses on co-teaching in the general education classroom wherever and whenever possible in order to avoid the learning gaps that plague traditional pull-outs.

We are a Title I school in which teachers and paraprofessionals provide interventions and enrichments which in conjunction with the aforementioned tools helped ACGC become a powerhouse program.

Powerhouse is our word. The Minnesota Department of Education prefers “reward school”. Either way, in 2012 and 2013, ACGC Elementary 5/6 was honored for its performance as one of top 15% of schools in Minnesota. In 2013 it was joined by its sister school serving kindergarten through fourth grade students in receiving that honor.

ACGC Elementary should be a National Blue Ribbon School because: -Innovative thinking, planning and follow-through drive the school with the clarity of purpose that came from realizing “everything we do is about student achievement”.

ACGC creates and operates hybrid programs that incorporate innovation via technology, data analytics and the notion that when adult behavior changes students achievement increases.

ACGC enjoys a strong affiliation with the Perpich Institute for the Arts and collaborate effectively with local districts, regional cooperatives, and statewide agencies. We make ourselves better by trading access to our unique skills and abilities for others that we have not discovered or cultivated in house. We publish, we share, and when we win everyone wins. Our educators hold positions of leadership in professional organizations and within the community. In return we enjoy the trust and loyalty of those around us.

Along the path of our success we have been acknowledged for innovation by the University of Minnesota’s Humphrey Institute, for influential leadership by Resource Training and Solutions, and for performance in the top fifteen percent of Minnesota schools by the Minnesota Department of Education. Finally, we have been nominated for this National Blue Ribbon School honor by the Minnesota Commissioner of Education.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

ACGC administers a district assessment along with curriculum assessments which allow for formative, summative and diagnostic assessment to determine district, grade-level, classroom, sub groups and student performance levels. ACGC develops obtainable goals through a proficiency rate gain scale with a goal of gaining 13% (on average) in overall district scores in the area of math and reading over the past four years. We recognize grade-level trends will flex which is why a district goal was created .

At the beginning of the school year students are assessed on district and curriculum assessments. The teachers use this data to start the yearlong data map on each student. Students in the 40th percentile and below are “flagged” for additional support through our Title I program where interventions begin. In addition, students receive Minnesota Reading and Math Corps to support growth individual needs. Students who are above the 40th percentile are considered to be on track for beginning of the year assessment. Students are assessed in this capacity four additional times throughout the school year. Each assessment adds another layer of support for students who are not at grade-level. Layers of support are discussed in weekly Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to ensure that our efforts are supported through the data. Student growth is evaluated with performance indicators for being on track to meet or exceed state standards. ACGC supports those students through Targeted Services which is an after school and Monday program that provides math and reading support through kinesthetic and interactive instruction. By mid-year, ACGC creates trend data on students and predicts with more certainty student outcomes on state assessments along with year growth. ACGC uses the trend data to target subgroups and develop updated intervention plans. ACGC builds connections with parents by sending information regarding their child’s performance on district and curriculum assessments along with an explanation of the data and areas of strength and need. Information advises parents on how the district can support their child’s growth.

ACGC’s Multiple Measures Rating (MMR) and Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA) are used to track process on increased academic achievement The performance levels on MCAs divide students into four levels. The lowest level a student can receive is a D which indicates “does not meet state standards”. The second level a student can receive is a P which indicates “partially meets state standards”. The third level a student can receive is a M which indicates “meets state standards”. The highest level that a student can receive is an E which indicates “exceeds state standards”.

3rd grade math trend overall is up 8.9% with special education up 46.7% and free and reduced up 6.4%. 4th grade math trend overall is up 5.3% with special education up 24.4% and free and reduced up 1.5%. 5th grade math trend overall is up 25.7% with special education up 33.4% and free and reduced up 14.8% 6th grade math trend overall is up 44.4% with special education up 15% and free and reduced up 50.8% Overall grades 3-6 trend is up 21.08% with special education up 29.88% and free and reduced up 18.38%

The state of Minnesota reading trend was down 14.3%, however ACGC did not see as significant drop and in some cases no drop at all.

3rd grade reading trend was down (4.5%) however special education was up 24.4% and free and reduced down (5%). 4th grade reading trend was down (4.3%) however special education was up 8.6% and free and reduced down (28.9%). 5th grade reading trend overall is up 11.5% with special education up 75% and free and reduced up 14.8% 6th grade reading trend overall is up 28% with special education up 50.9% and free and reduced up 35.6% Overall grades 3-6 trend is up 30.7% with special education up 39.73% and free and reduced up 13.5%

Over the last three years, 3rd and 4th grade has grown from a 5.4% MMR rating to a 94.97% MMR rating which focuses on student proficiency, student growth and closing the achievement gap. ACGC 3rd and 4th grade closed the math gap 4.4% for free and reduced while closing the special education math gap 18.3%. ACGC’s 3rd and 4th grade focus worked as we closed the free and reduced gap 8.1% and the special education gap 16%. Hence, K-4 is a gap closure school.

Over the last three years, 5th and 6th grade has grown from a 68.67% MMR rating to a 99.38% MMR rating which focuses on student proficiency, student growth and closing the achievement gap. ACGC 5th and 6th grade closed the math gap 7.5% for free and reduced while closing the special education math gap 52.3%. ACGC closed the reading gap 4% for free and reduced while closing the special education math gap 35.2%. ACGC is proud that math and reading achievement gaps in the areas of free and reduced and special education are all less than 10% in difference with means we have significantly closed the achievement gap. Hence, 5-6 is a high performing school.

Significant gains from our K-6 students are due to a focused effort on using data to create flexible grouping in order to meet the individual needs of each student. Teachers have focused strategies that were implemented with fidelity throughout the school year and discussed and evaluated through Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). Teachers received significant professional development on strategies and researched based formative assessments. Students received intervention and enrichment opportunities during and after school hours with an overall decision making theme that all we do is about student achievement. In addition, ACGC feels co-teaching has had the greatest effect on our special education and free and reduced population. Co-teaching has taken the strengths of applying accommodations and interventions of special education teachers and the regular education teachers' depth of knowledge of specific subjects and have woven them together to create optimal educational experiences for individual students.

2. Using Assessment Results:

Imagine the shape of an hour glass. ACGC uses this hour glass illustration to connect data, assessments and student improvements to parents, students and community. The top of our hour glass is our administration looking at whole district data to drive our school improvement and student performance. We then narrow down the hour glass to the teachers digging into data as a whole, followed by grade-level data with the narrowest part of our hour glass being individual student data. Our hour glass starts to expand as we bring data and strategies for improving student performance to our school board, followed by our parents and students and ending back with our largest part which is our community.

Administration uses the data collected by district, curriculum and state assessment to collect formative, summative and diagnostic assessments on our students. We look at trends, sub group data and proficiency to create district obtainable goals and consider how that information will drive our professional development.

Teachers create a data map on each student in order to improve student academic knowledge. We believe small group instruction supported by independent learning and real world experience will connect student learning on multiple levels. In addition to flexible grouping ACGC uses formative assessment to provide clear learning goals and scales for students which are standards based for both math and reading. We believe it is important for students to know what is expected of them, how they will be assessed and the importance of what is taught. Students and teachers collect data on student knowledge and understanding of the standard and are placed in groups according to their level of understanding. Our process allows for individual growth via support for each student. Teachers were training on the research that shows the effect of clear learning goals and scales on student achievement. ACGC has been showcased on our commitment to clear learning goals and scales.

ACGC School Board receives data and administration suggests obtainable district goals each year. In addition, the school board meets for a special retreat to discuss data and school results with the community.

Parents receive their child's results on district assessments five times per year along with diagnostic reports. Parents are given weekly assessment of standards results for math, reading and unit assessments (every six weeks) which chart summative data. Curriculum data is compared to district assessment data to ensure that accurate student outcomes are portrayed. The district hosts two personal conferences with parents to discuss student's growth and achievement toward state standards. Parents and mainstream teachers meet with support staff as well. Students self-evaluate their work on core areas, provide support for that evaluation and share with parents. Students show their progress visually by creating learning ladders on classroom walls as well as posting school results in our vestibule for the community to see our successes.

The community receives an ACGC Information Highway four times a year. It is important for all stakeholders to be informed of the school's progress. Our daily, weekly and monthly newsletters/bulletins are posted on our website with additional school news. Community members access our school blog which is designed to showcase student work through pictures, postings and videos.

3. Sharing Lessons Learned:

The ACGC school district recognizes the value of collaboration and seeks out opportunities to grow and to share.

Our telecommunications systems are linked by fiber-optic cable with fifteen other members of the Little Crow Telemedia Network which allows effective teleconferencing. The benefit to the district is a reduction in travel costs but more importantly it means additional time spent on-site with students. Late activity buses and shuttle buses after enrichments and targeted services ensure that the large geographical size of our district does not become a barrier to participation.

The North Principal Collaborative provides a critical outlet through which we have undertaken the following important sharing tasks:

- Mid-Level Math: shared curriculum, data, formative and summative assessment, manipulatives, discussions and strategies on increasing student achievement and closing achievement gaps
- Health and Physical Education Curriculum: created a network to review curriculum and write standard based lessons. Hosted Brain Gym training to incorporate core math and reading in multiple departments within 15 school districts
- Response to Intervention (RtI): Created a network of schools to guide, develop and implement RtI practices into the schools. RtI supports flexible groupings to make the most of enrichment and intervention time.
- Administrative Collaborative: Principals work collegially to direct and facilitate training and networking intra and inter school districts of the seven school collaborative

The Minnesota Association of School Business Officials provides a training structure through which our personnel have been able to provide the following training:

- ACGC personnel train newly elected school board members statewide on the topics of school finance, levies, budgets, and bonds.
- Alternative schedules: The four-day week is perceived primarily as a cost-saving measure. We were able to share the powerful advantages that this schedule provides in offering timely, effective staff development and remediation for lagging students.

The superintendent of the ACGC school district has mentored five candidates for administrative licensure from four districts in the area and those individuals have been given the opportunity to view and hopefully emulate the processes that make us so successful.

- Our superintendent (who also serves as high school principal) is scheduled to present at the Minnesota Association of School Administrators Women's conference on the topic of cross-functional administration and the value of front line interaction in strategic planning.

The District Leadership Committee (DLC) is a forum for instructors to share challenges and successes across grade levels and specialties. The primary focus points to date have been the successful application of common language, manipulatives, technology, guided reading, focused strategies, professional learning committees, and co-teaching.

4. Engaging Families and Community:

At ACGC we celebrate family and community engagement. We welcome the communities of Atwater, Cosmos and Grove City into our school through invitations to our annual open house to showcase the school and facilitate one on one interaction with staff regarding ACGC education. Community members are invited to participate in the Everyone Reads program where they come into the school to read and in so doing expose students to people and professions but also take personal ownership of what happens at school.

The communities receive a yearly State of the School Address presented throughout each community by the superintendent and board members. Education ACGC works in tandem with the Ministerial Association's HOPE (Helping Our Students Eat) project to provide backpacks of food for students and families for the weekend. With a 54% free and reduced population we ensure that our student's nutritional needs are met when they are not in school.

We directly communicate with families by utilizing online and hard copy surveys which address specific timely issues that are critical to our educational objectives. We use information gathered from survey to help our students, families and the community. A response to parent requests for additional help with homework and MCA prep prompted mini sessions offered to parents at a variety of times and dates. We also apply the use of electronic communication through opt-in email lists, the school's website, our ACGC blog, teacher blogs and schoology (a dedicated online community). To reach all of our families and communities, we include print media communications via post mail, newspapers, ACGC Information Highway (4 times per year), weekly parent newsletters from teachers, and monthly newsletters from the principal. ACGC supports parent communication by providing education booths at conferences.

ACGC uses this opportunity for parents and community members to discover information on available programs and services and for important contacts to develop. The most recent conferences included booths representing United Way, HOPE project, preschool, strategies to use at home for math and reading, school improvement efforts, Targeted Services (after school program), parent support services through the county, and nutrition.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

Understanding the Minnesota standards including Common Core is step one in our curriculum process.

As a district we analyze our state and national standards by exposures, lessons and assessments for each standard. Those standards and district data drive our determination of curriculum. It is not the curriculum that does the teaching it is the teacher expertise on standards and delivery models. Teachers are trained on formative assessments, differentiated instruction and using technology to apply the standards with fidelity while incorporating teaching elements for effective delivery of instruction.

In the first year of the curriculum cycle ACGC staff researches and matches standards to curricula. By the second year, ACGC samples curricula to match standards and evaluates them. Where commercially available curricula are deemed insufficient staff are assigned to work in tandem with surrounding districts or/and with the Minnesota Department of Education to develop appropriate additional resources. In the end of the third year, ACGC purchases the approved curriculum, trains staff, and implements it under the watchful eye of the principal, building operations manager and district leadership committee.

ACGC strives to create a K-12 alignment in all subject areas. In English Language Arts (ELA) we are fully aligned with state standards. We collaborate with elementary Spanish instruction to offer a unique insight into language structure as well as appreciation of culturally diverse populations.

In mathematics we are fully aligned with state standards. We use the Minnesota created Optional Local Purpose Assessment (OLPA) to determine student placement in departmentalized classrooms along with intervention and enrichment opportunities during the school day and after-school opportunities for grades 3-6.

We are currently working on aligning common core literacy standards in grades 6-12. Interactive leveled reading keeps our students working in an area which provides continuity while allowing them access to literature which caters to their own interests.

In Science we continue ongoing research in standards and sequencing of science branches. Departmentalized science settings in grades 3-6 along with close collaboration with high school science instructors who work collegially with elementary staff allow for more specific instruction.

We are fully aligned with 2011 Minnesota state standards for social studies. New and emerging social issues are woven into the literacy curriculum over time.

The art instruction staff at ACGC has fully aligned curricula with Minnesota state standards (<http://acgcart.weebly.com/5th-grade-state-art-standards.html>). The staff works in tandem with ELA and math standards.

Educational progress is assessed in a manner deemed most appropriate to the subject matter. Ongoing formative and summative assessments within each classroom along with Minnesota Comprehension Assessments (MCA) and Optional Local Purpose Assessment (OLPA) guide our instruction on a daily, weekly, monthly and annual basis.

Our health and physical education educators have aligned state standards with national standards. The staff incorporates reading and math skills into physical education using Brain Gym practices. ACGC is currently collaborating with neighboring districts to create standard based lesson plans.

Elementary Spanish is taught two times per week and supports social studies and ELA as well as culture understanding.

For student achievement all teachers converse using a common vocabulary, watching for gaps and overlaps in standards coverage all while using data to determine their instruction.

ACGC offers many unique curricula to enhance our educational programming. FLES (Foreign Language Elementary Spanish) is offered two times per week to increase cultural awareness. In addition Second Step Bully Prevention is offered weekly by our school social workers. In addition two school social workers are full time to meet the unique social and emotional needs of all students. The inclusion of Perpich Institute of the Arts: Dance Curricula (Brain Dance) encourages motor skills and enhances interaction between brain spheres. That interaction is taken further into our Boost Up program which incorporates movement in core standards on a daily basis. Minnesota Reading and Math Corp is a grant funded program which supports students struggling in math and reading. To help increase student success in reading, spelling and speech we use LiPS (Lindamood Phoneme Sequencing Program).

Technology is an important tool but it is our belief that technology is only as useful as the teacher's ability to apply the skills appropriate to student needs. As such, ACGC incorporates technology into education in a variety of ways. Every classroom includes SMARTBoards, iPad carts, online practice applications available for home access (<http://edu.symbaloo.com/shared/elementary20>) along with quick links on our school website, online curriculum accessibility including the Minnesota History Center and use of iPads for individual accommodations for special education and Title I populations.

The multiplicity and complexity of curricula in all components is a fluid process throughout the year based on student need.

2. Reading/English:

After cross-walking the curriculum with Minnesota State Standards and evaluation of the available commercial curricula, ACGC selected a curriculum that delivers scientifically research-based instruction aligned to Minnesota state standards based on a wealth of groundbreaking online experiences for high student engagement. Standards delivery is geared toward Response to Intervention (RtI) with a strong core emphasis on progress-monitoring and an explicit plan for managing small groups of students. The attention to small groups of students allows ACGC to deliver specific instruction to our free and reduced population, Title I population, special education, English language learners, and gifted and talented population. Our curriculum provides a foundation of learning for students with a focus on concept talk, vocabulary, target words, phonics, blending, conceptual understanding, fluency, writing and spelling of high frequency words. In addition, we can monitor students weekly, by unit (every six weeks for benchmarking) along with a pre and post school year assessment. The assessment data is used for targeting students for our Title I program, collecting intervention data, creating flexible groupings within our guided reading time and charting our overall student growth and achievement. The current curriculum is completely interactive with our SMART Boards and iPads.

We identified an excessive gap in our special education sub group which we attributed to a flawed traditional pull out setting. As a result we changed our approach not only in special education, but also in Title I, and traditional classrooms to a co-teaching model with appropriately licensed teachers.

In order to hit achievement targets we expanded contact time for reading from 60 minutes per day to 120 minutes per day. That additional time allowed the implementation of a daily five structure which caters to the needs of creating independent and small group leaders. We continue to focus on guided reading, daily standards instruction, and mini lessons in order to provide experience not only reading to self, but also reading to others. As an extension, we created our "Everyone Reads" program which invites in and utilized the skills of community members as presenters. This helps us not only by reinforcing the value of reading with our students but by creating a cadre of advocates in the community who feel a special connection to the school.

Differentiated instruction allows us to focus on enrichment for high achievers and re-teaching for those who struggle without disrupting the flow for our on-target learners.

3. Mathematics:

Having undergone the same meticulous cross-walking to standards as the reading curriculum, our mathematics curriculum is standards based and features daily problem oriented interactive math learning and visual learning strategies. The focus is on deepening conceptual understanding by making meaningful connections. We utilize weekly unit assessment as well as pre- and -post assessment. This permits us to do benchmarking and diagnostics on our students and allows for data-driven instruction with a focus on math process, vocabulary and visual learning. We break mathematics into four key strands: number sense operations, data analysis and probability, geometry and measurement and algebra. Each strand is identified within the lessons and exposures recorded in the ACGC standards binders that accompany students through their academic careers. The binders delineate standards, benchmarks, grade level exposures, tools, and resources.

Based upon assessments, the curriculum provides for differentiated instruction. Students move between re-teaching, on task, or enrichment and all students have access to manipulatives, foldables, a SMART Board, computer lab access, and iPad carts in order to apply their learning. The foldables are teacher-created and standard aligned tools which encourage hands-on application of math processes. The manipulatives are organized into math tubs. These tubs allow rotational access to a broad range of learning tools constructed by the teachers. This buy-in at the earliest stage ensures not only that the activities are aligned to standards but also that the instructors' familiarity with them allows them to seamlessly move from group to group supporting learning for students at all levels of achievement.

SMART Board work utilizes technology in the large group setting for demonstration and interactive learning. Students have the opportunity to celebrate success and to demonstrate their own developing strategies to their classmates. The iPad carts and the computer labs facilitate user-driven pacing and success-oriented advancement through an increasingly challenging series of applications. As an elementary school we have set the goal of adding an additional 25 minutes per day devoted to hands-on, interactive mathematics application to the current 90 minutes of math study.

ACGC is working K-12 to align core standards and build conversation between senior high and elementary to develop common vocabulary and teaching strategies. In order to limit gaps and overlaps we utilize standards binders to record exposures, assessments, and activities.

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

Physical Education and Health

At ACGC we believe a fit and well-nourished brain builds the foundation for learning. In order to accomplish this, ACGC incorporated a research based curriculum initially developed to prevent and reduce childhood obesity. It intertwines into our afterschool, health, nutrition, English language arts and math programs. Much of what we use is a well-known commercial curriculum but at ACGC we have truly made it our own. One of the key features of our hybrid curricula is what we call "Brain Gym" in which students are assigned academic problems while exercising. It included components for school wide comprehensive health and after school physical activity. National standards have evolved to state/ACGC standards.

Brain Gym: Research states that higher academic achievement can be related to high levels of fitness. "Brain Gym" is not just taught in a gymnasium, but it applied in math, science, social studies and reading classrooms.

Perpich Institute for the Arts- Dance: Through a two year grant with the Perpich Institute, ACGC students and faculty are provided with opportunity to infuse existing curricula with unique and innovative movement concepts. Learning new concepts and building on foundational information through movement facilitates increased brain processing and results in faster and increased learning. Perpich skills build on cultural awareness. ACGC is working with the Minneapolis Public Schools on cultural awareness between districts.

Boost Up: PK-2 Students engage in a multi-sensory program that includes large motor movements, visual activities, auditory activities, yoga exercises, reflex integrations, neurofeedback and Therapeutic Listening all while learning math and reading skills.

DAPE (Developmental Adapted Physical Education): Using learning goals and scales, students self-monitor exertion rates while learning life skills as per their Individualized Education Plan (IEP).

Nutrition- ACGC has adopted in all components of food service the 2013 USDA Food and Nutrition Standards for all food sold in schools along with a Wellness Policy. ACGC meets the requirements of the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act. We have received the Fruits and Vegetables Grant which provided all students with a FREE afternoon vegetable snack. ACGC has a school garden which allows us to use the food grown as an educational tool and serve in our school cafeteria. Kandiyohi County Extension Services provides health lessons, My Plate information, health promotion, introduction of new food opportunities. ACGC is a part of SHIP (Statewide Health Improvement Program) and Farm-to-School.

At ACGC we believe that a healthy body and mind create the ideal setting for learning.

5. Instructional Methods:

At ACGC, we believe everything is about student achievement and creating instruction that is conducive to the learning styles of our students. ACGC maximizes learning time for all first through sixth grade students with 189 additional hours in a school year above state requirements. ACGC has provided a fully funded all day every day Kindergarten for the past ten years allowing students to receive 698 additional hours in a year. Differentiated instruction is provided to accommodate all our students' needs. ACGC recognizes the instructional value of small class sizes and high qualified teachers as a district priority.

In our math and reading blocks, ACGC dedicates 120 minutes to reading and 90 minutes to math daily with a special education and Title I schedules that support co-teaching and instructional methods. Within the classroom setting, our students are divided into small, flexible groups. Our flexible grouping is geared toward increasing students' ability to master standards, becoming independent learners and developing a love for reading and math through real world experiences (field trips aligned to state standards) that allow for students to be career and college ready. Our instruction allows teachers to provide small groups of students support as they learn to use various math and reading strategies (comprehension strategies through the Perpich Center of the Arts). ACGC targets the free and reduced and special education population (all other subgroups are minimal in cell size) to ensure that their learning needs are met. Our special education population receives instruction from two licensed teachers during their instruction time along with paraprofessional support through the co-teaching process. Individual needs of the students are met while being exposed to the same standards, vocabulary and key concepts of their peers. Our Title I program follows the same philosophy in that our free and reduced population receives small group instruction with a licensed Title I teacher where individual needs are met.

All students have daily access to 1:1 iPads during their math and reading time to allow for individual skills and standards to be assessed, immediate data to be collected and enrichment and intervention opportunities provided. Technology is used as a tool with discretion.

At ACGC we feel that if we expect all students to achieve at a high level we need to expose them to the grade-level standards in a supportive environment designed by the teachers during their daily 75 minutes common prep time.

6. Professional Development:

Student achievement drives our professional development decisions because better teachers make better students. Data on student progress guides teachers and administration in the creation of an annual professional development plan. We operate within this framework but recognize that as the year progresses the plan may change. Such alterations simply reflect the dynamic environment in which we operate. Professional development needs to be focused but flexible in order to meet the ever changing needs of continued student achievement.

Both administrators and teachers are key to our planning and delivery of development opportunities. We have created an "ACGC Model" of train the trainer so we can keep experts in the field right here in our

district. We currently benefit from trained experts in data, technology, Response to Intervention, Teacher Professional Growth Plan and reading and math strategies. Administration secures financial support and collects objective and subjective data to help determine training needs. Administration is trained on each of these levels as well and must be held to the same standards and expectations as our teachers.

We have aligned ourselves with a powerful support network of regional entities as well. The Southwest Minnesota Service Cooperative, Minnesota Regional Centers of Excellence, Resource Training and Solutions and the Minnesota Department of Education all aid in our student achievement at various levels.

Our work with the North Principals Collaborative has created a common calendar to allow for networking inter-district with seven other regional districts. Through this venture we have created professional development networking in the following ways:

- Health and PE teachers from ACGC and 5 others districts work on understanding standards and writing common “I can” statements for those standards. At ACGC we hosted Brain Gym training for 15 other school districts that now provide interventions for their students in reading and math.
- Mid level math teachers meet with the other districts for data analysis, assessments, designing manipulatives and discussion about building strategies for increasing student achievement and closing achievement gaps.

Probably the greatest underlying factor in accomplishing all of this work is our ability to use Mondays for development thanks to our four day school week. This is indeed a strength and is key to our ability to stay timely and relevant in training which in turn enhances student learning.

7. School Leadership

The ACGC school board has set goals according to the Minnesota Department of Education’s proficiency rate gains to support instructional practice, increased reading and math scores and to adopt a professional growth model for all teachers.

The goals set forth by the school board are enacted by the school principal in conjunction with our site leadership team. Each year a comprehensive needs assessment is conducted to collect the needs of the community, parents, staff and students. The needs drive our building goals and strategies are developed for each goal. The leadership team creates practice profiles and rubrics to guide our improvement efforts and allow us to critique the progress. Within the process we are constantly using the Plan-Do-Study-Act model in which we monitor, process and reevaluate our work in order to maximize the outcome of student achievement. Our work is monitored not only by our site leadership team, but by our District Leadership Team (DLT) and our District Advisory Committee (DAC) to which both have community members, parents and staff contribute to the progress of the school.

Our leadership team consists of an award winning superintendent/principal who demonstrates knowledge of all levels PK-12 and post-secondary competencies, ensures policies and procedures are directed toward student success and communicates the state of the school to stakeholders. In her dual role, understanding and involvement far exceeds that of a traditional superintendent as evidenced by her ability to support all levels of educational decision making. In addition our PK-6 principal, recently nominated by her peers, was a finalist for an Elementary Leadership Award. Her teaching licensure and additional administrative licensure in special education mean that she is acutely aware of the different rates at which students will master material and the wide range of methods that must be employed to accommodate a range of learning styles. Her energy, technology application and creativity are invaluable in an environment where nearly half of her classroom teachers are in their first three years of teaching. Overall, the administrative team, teachers, and parents together make decisions related to our theme that: “At ACGC everything is about student achievement.”

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

All Students Tested/Grade: 3

Publisher:

Test:

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 84 | 73 | 73 | 76 | 75 |
| % Exceeds | 30 | 20 | 16 | 25 | 16 |
| Number of students tested | 56 | 40 | 44 | 49 | 44 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 70 | 60 | 62 | 84 | 63 |
| % Exceeds | 26 | 10 | 5 | 20 | 5 |
| Number of students tested | 23 | 20 | 21 | 25 | 19 |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 67 | 33 | 33 | 75 | 20 |
| % Exceeds | 33 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 9 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 100 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 7. American Indian or | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|
| Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 85 | 74 | 75 | 77 | 74 |
| % Exceeds | 30 | 21 | 18 | 27 | 16 |
| Number of students tested | 53 | 38 | 40 | 44 | 43 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: Proficient means students meets or exceeds the Minnesota State Standards. Exceeds means students exceed the Minnesota State Standards.

The State of Minnesota groups the subgroups of Asian and Pacific Islander together.

The MCAIII was administered from 2010-2011 through current years; prior to 2010-2011 the MCAII was administered.

Blank Cell: School Scores: In 2010-2011, one student was administered an alternative assessment through the MTAS. This person is not included in the data for the other subgroups.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

All Students Tested/Grade: 4

Publisher:

Test:

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
| Testing month | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 64 | 68 | 43 | 50 | 58 |
| % Exceeds | 15 | 12 | 16 | 5 | 22 |
| Number of students tested | 47 | 41 | 51 | 42 | 36 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 60 | 47 | 50 | 46 | 58 |
| % Exceeds | 9 | 0 | 13 | 4 | 21 |
| Number of students tested | 22 | 15 | 30 | 24 | 19 |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 44 | 29 | 25 | 17 | 20 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 9 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 5 |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 67 | 33 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 67 | 63 | 43 | 49 | 64 |
| % Exceeds | 16 | 13 | 15 | 5 | 24 |
| Number of students tested | 45 | 38 | 47 | 41 | 33 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: Proficient means students meets or exceeds the Minnesota State Standards. Exceeds means students exceed the Minnesota State Standards.

The State of Minnesota groups the subgroups of Asian and Pacific Islander together.

Blank Cell: School Scores: The MCAIII was administered from 2010-2011 through current years; prior to 2010-2011 the MCAII was administered.

In 2011-2012, one student was administered an alternative assessment through the MTAS. This person is not included in the data for the other subgroups.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

All Students Tested/Grade: 5

Publisher:

Test:

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
| Testing month | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 82 | 64 | 59 | 68 | 56 |
| % Exceeds | 26 | 25 | 18 | 30 | 24 |
| Number of students tested | 55 | 67 | 56 | 60 | 59 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 8 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 67 | 60 | 57 | 79 | 52 |
| % Exceeds | 13 | 15 | 18 | 28 | 19 |
| Number of students tested | 24 | 40 | 28 | 29 | 27 |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 67 | 13 | 0 | 50 | 33 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 3 | 8 | 3 | 8 | 12 |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 75 | 33 | 0 | 60 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 4 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 82 | 65 | 58 | 69 | 56 |
| % Exceeds | 28 | 27 | 18 | 31 | 24 |
| Number of students tested | 51 | 63 | 55 | 55 | 59 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: Proficient means students Meets or Exceeds the Minnesota State Standards. Exceeds means students exceed the Minnesota State Standards.

The State of Minnesota groups the subgroups of Asian and Pacific Islander together, subgroup 6.

The MCA III was administered from 2010-2011 through current years; prior to 2010-2011 the MCA II was administered.

Students who took alternative assessments are included in these two rows in the table. See below.

In 2013, 4 students took the MODIII with 100% Proficient and 75% Exceeds and 1 student took the MTAS with 0% Proficient and 0% Exceeds.

In 2012, 1 student took the MODIII with 0% Proficient and 0% Exceeds.

In 2011, 1 student took the MODIII with 0% Proficient and 0% Exceeds and 2 students took the MTAS with 0% Proficient and 0% Exceeds.

In 2010, 1 student took the MTAS with 100% Proficient and 100% Exceeds.

In 2009, 1 student took the MTAS with 100% Proficient and 0% Exceeds.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

All Students Tested/Grade: 6

Publisher:

Test:

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
| Testing month | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 75 | 90 | 50 | 62 | 30 |
| % Exceeds | 37 | 89 | 22 | 35 | 13 |
| Number of students tested | 59 | 52 | 64 | 60 | 53 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | 4 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 6 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 77 | 86 | 47 | 62 | 26 |
| % Exceeds | 27 | 33 | 13 | 35 | 7 |
| Number of students tested | 30 | 21 | 32 | 29 | 27 |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 40 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 5 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 10 |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 100 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 67 |
| % Exceeds | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Number of students tested | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 100 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|
| Number of students tested | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 73 | 90 | 50 | 61 | 28 |
| % Exceeds | 38 | 37 | 23 | 36 | 12 |
| Number of students tested | 55 | 51 | 60 | 59 | 50 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: Proficient means students Meets or Exceeds the Minnesota State Standards. Exceeds means students exceed the Minnesota State Standards.

The State of Minnesota groups the subgroups of Asian and Pacific Islander together, subgroup 6.

The MCA III was administered from 2010-2011 through current years; prior to 2010-2011 the MCA II was administered.

Students who took alternative assessments are included in only these two rows in the table. See below.

In 2013, 4 students took the MODIII with 100% Proficient and 50% Exceeds.

In 2012, 4 students took the MODIII with 50% Proficient and 0% Exceeds and 1 student took the MTASIII with 100% proficient and 0% Exceeds.

In 2011, 1 student took the MODII with 0% Proficient and 0% Exceeds.

In 2010, 1 student took the MTAS with 100% Proficient and 0% Exceeds.

In 2009, 3 students took the MTAS with 66.7% Proficient and 66.7% Exceeds.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 3
Publisher:

Test:
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
| Testing month | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 75 | 73 | 80 | 63 | 80 |
| % Exceeds | 14 | 43 | 39 | 33 | 48 |
| Number of students tested | 56 | 40 | 44 | 49 | 44 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 74 | 60 | 71 | 56 | 79 |
| % Exceeds | 13 | 40 | 24 | 20 | 47 |
| Number of students tested | 23 | 20 | 21 | 25 | 19 |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 44 | 0 | 17 | 25 | 20 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 9 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 50 | 25 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 100 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 76 | 74 | 83 | 64 | 81 |
| % Exceeds | 15 | 42 | 40 | 34 | 49 |
| Number of students tested | 53 | 38 | 40 | 44 | 43 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: Proficient means students meets or exceeds the Minnesota State Standards. Exceeds means students exceed the Minnesota State Standards.

The State of Minnesota groups the subgroups of Asian and Pacific Islander together.

The MCAIII was administered in 2012-2013; prior to 2012-2013 the MCAII was administered.

Blank Cell: School Scores: In 2010-2011, one student was administered an alternative assessment through the MTAS. This person is not included in the data for the other subgroups.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 4
Publisher:

Test:
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
| Testing month | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 60 | 75 | 58 | 67 | 64 |
| % Exceeds | 15 | 33 | 18 | 19 | 28 |
| Number of students tested | 47 | 40 | 50 | 42 | 36 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 50 | 67 | 62 | 71 | 79 |
| % Exceeds | 9 | 13 | 10 | 21 | 26 |
| Number of students tested | 22 | 15 | 29 | 24 | 19 |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 29 | 14 | 17 | 20 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Number of students tested | 9 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 5 |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 50 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 67 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 60 | 78 | 61 | 68 | 64 |
| % Exceeds | 16 | 35 | 17 | 20 | 30 |
| Number of students tested | 45 | 36 | 46 | 41 | 33 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: Proficient means students meets or exceeds the Minnesota State Standards. Exceeds means students exceed the Minnesota State Standards.

The State of Minnesota groups the subgroups of Asian and Pacific Islander together.

The MCAIII was administered in 2012-2013; prior to 2012-2013 the MCAII was administered.

Blank Cell: School Scores: In 2011-2012, one student was administered an alternative assessment through the

MTAS. This person is not included in the data for the other subgroups.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

All Students Tested/Grade: 5

Publisher:

Test:

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
| Testing month | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % exceeds | 76 | 87 | 89 | 70 | 64 |
| % Exceeds | 20 | 25 | 40 | 32 | 22 |
| Number of students tested | 54 | 63 | 53 | 60 | 59 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | 6 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 10 | 6 | 10 | 2 | 2 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % exceeds | 67 | 90 | 81 | 69 | 52 |
| % Exceeds | 13 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 11 |
| Number of students tested | 24 | 38 | 26 | 29 | 27 |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % exceeds | 100 | 60 | 0 | 50 | 25 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 2 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 12 |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % exceeds | 75 | 100 | 0 | 60 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 50 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 4 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % exceeds | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % exceeds | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % exceeds | 76 | 87 | 89 | 71 | 64 |
| % Exceeds | 22 | 23 | 40 | 33 | 22 |
| Number of students tested | 50 | 60 | 52 | 55 | 59 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: Proficient means students Meets or Exceeds the Minnesota State Standards. Exceeds means students exceed the Minnesota State Standards.

The State of Minnesota groups the subgroups of Asian and Pacific Islander together, subgroup 6.

The MCA III was administered in 2012-2013; prior to 2012-2013 the MCA II was administered.

Students who took alternative assessments are included in these two rows in the table. See below.

In 2013, 5 students took the MODIII with 60% Proficient and 60% Exceeds and 1 student took the MTASIII with 100% Proficient and 0% Exceeds.

In 2012, 4 students took the MODII with 50% Proficient and 50% Exceeds.

In 2011, 4 students took the MODII with 25% Proficient and 0% Exceeds and 2 students took the MTAS with 50% Proficient and 50% Exceeds.

In 2010, 1 student took the MTAS with 100% Proficient and 100% Exceeds.

In 2009, 1 student took the MTAS with 100% Proficient and 100% Exceeds.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 6
Publisher:

Test:
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
| Testing month | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 78 | 89 | 67 | 67 | 50 |
| % Exceeds | 20 | 44 | 32 | 45 | 20 |
| Number of students tested | 59 | 52 | 63 | 60 | 54 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | 4 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 6 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 80 | 81 | 63 | 66 | 44 |
| % Exceeds | 20 | 38 | 22 | 48 | 11 |
| Number of students tested | 30 | 21 | 32 | 29 | 27 |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 60 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 9 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 5 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 11 |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 100 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 67 |
| % Exceeds | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Number of students tested | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 100 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|
| Number of students tested | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 77 | 88 | 66 | 66 | 49 |
| % Exceeds | 16 | 45 | 34 | 46 | 20 |
| Number of students tested | 56 | 51 | 59 | 59 | 51 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: Proficient means students Meets or Exceeds the Minnesota State Standards. Exceeds means students exceed the Minnesota State Standards.

The State of Minnesota groups the subgroups of Asian and Pacific Islander together, subgroup 6.

The MCA III was administered in 2012-2013; prior to 2012-2013 the MCA II was administered.

Students who took alternative assessments are included in only these two rows in the table. See below.

In 2013, 4 students took the MODIII with 100% Proficient and 100% Exceeds.

In 2012, 4 students took the MODIII with 50% Proficient and 0% Exceeds and 2 students took the MTASIII with 100% proficient and 50% Exceeds.

In 2011, 1 student took the MODII with 100% Proficient and 100% Exceeds.

In 2010, 1 student took the MTAS with 100% Proficient and 100% Exceeds.

In 2009, 2 students took the MTAS with 50% Proficient and 50% Exceeds.